

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/573,809	Applicant(s) KAWATO ET AL.	
	Examiner David Buttner	Art Unit 1796	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) David Buttner. (3) Toshiya Abiko.
 (2) Stefan Koschmieder. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hiroshi.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant points to specification's table that shows superiority of phosphines against phosphates and applicant argues the proposed rejection considers phosphines, phosphates and phosphites as equivalent; however examiner pointed out Hiroshi uses phosphites in his examples - a convincing showing should compare phosphites - the closest exemplified art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David Buttner/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796